



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

his existence as a disturbing element; he does not marry because of the burden that would be imposed upon him. When the war breaks out he joins his regiment reluctantly and because not doing so would be likely to cause him much more trouble than to do his duty; once in the army he is very anxious to avoid all unnecessary labor; he is friendly to his soldiers, and that is all. Gradually, however, he comes to realize that the plain man of the people is morally fully the equal, often the superior, of the man with the cultivated mind. He cannot help noticing and enjoying the beauty of human brotherhood as it is manifested in the war. He has a relapse into pessimism when left to his thoughts in the hospital, while recovering from a serious wound, but with the return of health a lofty optimism and faith in human nature finally win. If such a book does not appeal to the general public, as do the others mentioned, it is fully equal to any of them in keenness and conscientious workmanship.

SMITH COLLEGE

ALBERT SCHINZ

The Life of Lazarillo de Tormes and His Fortunes and Adversities.

Done out of the Castilian from R. Foulché-Delbosc's restitution of the *Editio Princeps* by LOUIS HOW with an Introduction and Notes by CHARLES PHILIP WAGNER. New York: Mitchell Kinnerley, 1917.

This book is an important contribution to *Lazarillo* studies. Mr. How's translation is far superior to any previous rendering of this text into English. It will supersede the versions of Rowland, Blakeston, Roscoe, and Sir Clements Markham. It is more accurate than any of these and no whit inferior in readableness and literary distinction. Professor Wagner has assembled in his introduction and notes all the important results of previous scholars, together with many valuable, original suggestions of his own.

Mr. How wisely chose as the basis for his translation Foulché-Delbosc's composite text, thereby avoiding the mistakes of Cejador and Bonilla, who in their recent texts of the *Lazarillo* attach undue importance to the Burgos and Antwerp texts respectively. Good as the translation is, it is not infallible. I suggest the following possible betterments. Page 5: Add the words "who went thither" after "knight." Page 7: Omission of the phrase *hazia perdidas*. Translate: "and he made away with the rugs and horse blankets." *Casa*, "house," means "religious establishment" in this context. Page 12: How translates *no me demediaua de lo necessario*: "didn't share even the necessaries with me." Better: "didn't give me half what I needed." Page 13: The difficult phrase *tan por contadoro* is too freely rendered, "so well counted." Page 15: *Capuz* means here "gown" rather than "hood." Page 20: "Towns" rather than "places." "Would move away" is too weak. I suggest, "would take French leave." *Para echarlo*

en el fardel tornauase mosto, y lo que a el se llegaua is wrongly rendered, "if put into the sack, it would turn to must, and so we decided on this," etc. The last phrase is a complete misunderstanding. Better, "if put into the sack, it and whatever came close to it would turn to must." Page 24: "That I had to enjoy myself with." Read: "that I was to enjoy." Page 25: *Hallose en frio* does not mean, "he found himself chilled," but corresponds rather to the modern *estar* or *quedarse fresco*. The translator has sacrificed accuracy to maintain the pun. We might say in slang, "He found that he had received a cold deal in the form of the cold turnip." Page 26: Add "and substitution" after "exchange." "Wretched" rather than "black sausage." *Golosina* here means "tidbit" rather than "gluttony"; it refers literally to the sausage. Page 27: "That it abandoned its stolen goods." Better: "that the stolen goods hit it," i.e., the blind man's nose. Page 28: *Con* should be rendered "although" instead of "because." *Demanda* is a legal term and means "accusation" rather than "requests." Page 29: *Hombre* means "one," "anybody," not "man." Page 36: "Because I had nowhere to make him jump." Wrong. Better: "Because I had no means of attacking him." Page 37: "From him" instead of "from it." Page 38: "However it might be most to his service." Better: "However he might be most pleased." Page 41: "Miserly" rather than "miserable." Page 42: Omit "come." Page 45: "Are we placed by being born?" Read: "Are we mortals placed?" Translate *passar* by "suffer" or "endure" rather than by "change." Page 47: "Wretched" for "darksome." "Rendered keen" rather than "animated." Page 50: *Contino el gato estaua armado dentro del arca*, "the cat was continually on watch inside the chest." Read: "Straightway the trap was set inside the chest." Page 51: "Gown" rather than "clothes." Page 52: *Trasgo*, "goblin" rather than "ghost." Page 53: *Muy a menudo*, "frequently" rather than "very minute." Farther on an omission. Read: "so that my startled master heard it." Page 54: *Contaua el que se auia llegado a mi*, "he used to relate that he had come to me." This should be rendered: "he calculated that he had come up to me." Page 55: *He caçado* does not mean "I have been hunting," but means "I have caught." Page 56: *Con todo esto* means "nevertheless" not "meanwhile." *Demediar* means not "help" but "give (me) half enough." Page 58: *Andando assi discurriendo de puerta en puerta*, "I was wandering thus aimlessly from door to door." Better: "Thus reasoning as I walked from door to door." The meaning of *discurriendo* is determined by what precedes. Page 60: *Manga* means in this context "pouch" or "bag" not "sleeve." Page 61: "Fit for the public ear" not "appropriate." Page 63: "Those I had got in God's name." Better: "those I had got by begging." Page 66: "But now we shall have to do otherwise." Omit "have to." Page 69: "And he went down the street." Change "down" to "up." Why not follow Morel-Fatio's suggestion and change "Count of Arcos" to "Count of Claros"? Foulché-Delbosc does not do so, neither do Cejador and Bonilla, but the

point has been fully proved. Page 70: "Where I saw." Insert "in a garden" after "where." Page 79: *Pan* here has the old meaning "wheat" rather than "bread." Page 82: *A desora* is "suddenly," "unexpectedly," rather than "in an evil hour." Page 89: *Todavía passa su lazeria*, "then his indigence passes." Better: "he still suffers indigence." "To laugh at his pleasantries," etc. Throughout this passage the translator fails to recognize the divided conditional. Page 90: "To tell some trifles." Rather: "to give a few sharp spur-pricks." "Amusing things." Better: "accomplishments." Page 94: "For the love of God." Better: "For the sake of Charity." Page 96: "Monastery" rather than "convent." Page 103: *De su estado*, "full length" rather than "from his footing." Page 110: "To the scrivener and to the members of the council." Read: "to his scrivener and that of the council." Page 112: Read: "ten captives" instead of "two captives." Page 116: "I also underwent sufferings." Read: "I also underwent a tolerable number of sufferings." Page 122: Change "because" to "that." Much that I have here considered wrong may be due to a certain freedom which the translator has felt justified in employing for the sake of style. If I call attention to errors it is solely to make more useful his very serviceable book.

Mr. Wagner's contribution to the volume is even better. He gives us the best succinct summing up of the *Lazarillo* problems anywhere available and evinces unusual thoroughness and sagacity. The only important bibliographical omission is his failure to use Bonilla y San Martín's edition (Madrid, 1915). It appeared two years before Wagner's study, but possibly this was finished before the Bonilla edition became available. In his discussion of the dating of the *Lazarillo*, Wagner's argument seems more plausible than Bonilla's. And he has done far more than any of his predecessors toward reconstructing the folklore background underlying the first of the great picaresque novels. His merit is to have studied the *Lazarillo* from a European rather than from a narrowly Spanish viewpoint. As an example of Wagner's acuteness see page xxiii and note, where he proves that the allusion to the *Lazarillo* in Cristóbal de Villalón's *Crotalón* refers to the underlying folklore original, not to the anonymous *Segunda Parte*, as De Haan and Bonilla had supposed. He is less discerning, I think, when he follows authority in considering the unique passages of the Alcalá edition to be late interpolations. Did not these passages too belong to the lost original? See page 24 of the present work, immediately after the first long "interpolation," where the author of the *Lazarillo* writes: "But not to be prolix, I omit an account of many things, as funny as they are worthy of note, which befel me with this my first master," etc. In mediaeval and Renaissance manuscripts omissions from, and condensations of, the source are frequently indicated by such remarks as this. Furthermore the author of the alleged interpolation has also condensed his source. Further adventures at the inn with the "eating-house women and nougat-sellers, and prostitutes, and such

women-folk" are plainly promised but not supplied. There is also evident condensation in the short chapters toward the end. Some few at least of the "thousand ills" suffered in the service of the tambourine painter must have been described in the lost source. Otherwise it is difficult to account for the introduction of this personage.

Wagner has found no less than seven European versions of the "smell-the-post" story and promises an article on the subject. I prefer the term "the blind man's leap" rather than the former, because it does not seem to me that the post necessarily figures in the trick. Everybody is familiar with the quotation from *Much Ado about Nothing* in which Shakespeare betrays familiarity with the story. But so far as I know, no commentator, either upon Shakespeare or the *Lazarillo*, has ever pointed out the possible connection between the leap of Gloucester (*King Lear*, Act IV, scene vi) and that of the blind beggar in the *Lazarillo*. As early as 1754 a Mrs. Lennox indicated as the source of the Gloucester-Edgar-Edmund story *The Paphlagonian Unkind King*, an episodic story introduced by Sir Philip Sidney into Book II of his *Arcadia*. But in this story Shakespeare found only a suggestion for the trick played upon the blind man by his guide. The king, wishing to commit suicide, asks his guide to lead him to the top of a high rock. This, Leonatus, the dutiful son, simply refuses to do. Now Shakespeare, on reading the *Arcadia*, was struck by the resemblance between the fate of the Paphlagonian king and that of King Lear. Both had been betrayed by favorite children, and each was aided in his distress by a child previously treated with injustice and cruelty. Therefore he wove these two very similar stories into one. Is it not possible that the situation of the blind man and his guide, figuring in Sidney's tale, similarly suggested to Shakespeare the story of Lazarillo and his blind master? He may easily have read the Rowland translation of 1576; and if not directly familiar with the *Lazarillo* he at least knew some other version of "the blind man's leap" story, as the allusion in *Much Ado about Nothing* clearly proves: "Ho! now you strike like the blind man; 'twas the boy that stole your meat, and you'll beat the post" (Act II, scene i). Hunter long ago saw that the deception practiced upon Gloucester by Edgar had no parallel in Sidney. He considered that this feature of the sub-plot was an unhappy invention of Shakespeare's own.¹ Gloucester, desiring death as the only solution of his troubles, asks his guide to lead him to the edge of Dover cliff (suggested by the "high rock" of Sidney's tale). Gloucester—and here we have a notable departure from Sidney—is unaware that his guide is his son; for Edgar has assumed the rôle of a mad beggar, Tom of Bedlam. Edgar, instead of complying with his father's wishes or openingly refusing, as in Sidney, leads the blind man to an open field and urges him to jump. He does so and falls prone. Edgar then lifts up the old man, assumes a different voice, reveals his identity, and

¹ Hunter, *New Illustrations*, London, 1845, II, p. 273. Quoted by Furness, *A New Variorum Edition of Shakespeare, King Lear*. Eleventh Edition, Philadelphia, n. d.

makes his father believe that the latter has actually taken the leap and that his life has been preserved by a miracle. As in the *Lazarillo* we have a blind man deceived by his leader into taking a leap wholly different from the one he proposes. Here the resemblance ends. In the one case the deceit is prompted by malice; the injury, even the death, of the blind man is sought. In the other the imposture is inspired by filial piety, and the aim is to bring the blind man out of his despair by means of a pious fraud. This episode may represent a union of Sidney's story with the "blind man's leap" story; but of course this is speculation difficult of proof. I merely offer this as a suggestion to Professor Wagner for use in the comparative study of the story which he has promised.

GEORGE T. NORTHUP

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO

Comedia Famosa de Las Burlas Veras de Ivlian de Armendariz.

Edited by S. I. MILLARD ROSENBERG, Philadelphia, 1917.

Pp. 206. Publications of the University of Pennsylvania.

Department of Romanic Languages and Literatures.

The ideal dissertation should open fields for farther investigation, and it is always a pleasure to see new fruits resulting from an old study. Mr. Rosenberg, after publishing as his dissertation *La Española de Florencia o Burlas y Amor Invencionero*, has given proof of continued zeal by making accessible two other equally important works whose similarity of title had led bibliographers into hopeless confusion. The second of these was *Las Burlas Veras* of Lope de Vega; the third, with which we are now concerned is a play of the same title by Julian de Armendariz. Its chief interest lies in the fact that it is the sole surviving play of one of Spain's minor dramatists, of whose work we had hitherto known little. The play itself is mediocre; it interests principally for its vivid scenes of student life.

In the first three chapters of his introduction, R. discusses the whole cycle of plays, repeating much that he had said in previous studies. The facsimiles in this volume had also been printed previously. One sees at once that R. still clings to his more than doubtful theory that Calderón wrote *La Española de Florencia*, in spite of A. L. Stiefel's arguments to the contrary. All will agree that the absence of a title in the Veragua list is no proof that Calderón did not write a given play. But in this case Calderón has expressly denied the authorship. A heavy burden of proof rests upon one who would father this foundling upon an author who denies its parentage, and R. offers nothing but subjective impressions, and similarities of style. Many after reading the play are equally confident that Calderón did not write it. The situation is the same as regards *La tía fingida*. Many scholars think they detect in this story undoubted traces of Cervantes' style; others are equally confident that the master never wrote a line of it. Now it may well be doubted if the authorship of any work can be determined on the basis of